



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,554	08/18/2003	Jeffrey J. Thramann	46620.830007.US1	4937
26582	7590	10/17/2006	EXAMINER	
HOLLAND & HART, LLP P.O BOX 8749 DENVER, CO 80201			TYSON, MELANIE RUANO	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3731		

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> <b>10/643,554</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b> <b>THRAMANN, JEFFREY J.</b>
	<b>Examiner</b> <b>Melanie Tyson</b>	<b>Art Unit</b> <b>3731</b>

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitations "at least one branch stent graft adapted to be placed in the branch vessel prior to placement of the main vessel stent graft" and "means for coupling the second stent graft to the second vessel" are new limitations not previously presented and would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicant's arguments towards claims 1-9, Evans et al. disclose a tubular prosthesis (10) comprising a radially expansible tubular body. The tubular body is a braided structure with a porosity sufficient to permit the tubular prosthesis to further act as a graft structure (column 3, lines 43-58). Therefore, Evans et al. disclose a "stent graft." Furthermore, although the prior art is not intended to reside in a perivascular space (thereby inhibiting blood flow into the perivascular space), align with a puncture point on a wall of a vessel, reside in aneurysms, and reside in branch vessels, the prior art is capable of performing these functions since it meets the structural criteria as set forth by the metes and bounds of the claimed limitations. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Marsham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)*. Evans et al. further disclose a separate prosthesis segment (56; identical in construction to 10, therefore, the segment is also a "stent graft"; column 10, lines 47-48). The stent graft (56) is flexible (column 2, lines 12-15) and although it is usually shorter, it may be constructed with any desired length (column 10, lines 47-50). Therefore, the stent graft (56) is inherently capable of being positioned outside the vessel in a perivascular space and bent back towards the vessel in order to be positioned in a sealing relationship with the vessel. In this configuration the stent graft (56) "bypasses" a portion of the vascular anatomy, hence is a "bypass stent graft." In the alternative, it would have been obvious to position the stent graft (56) outside the vessel in a perivascular space and bend it back towards the vessel to be positioned in a sealing relationship with the main vessel in order to "bypass" an occluded portion of the vascular anatomy.

NOTE: Claims 10-20 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see above).

  
ANHTUAN T. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10/15/06.